


PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY



To:

see form PCT/ISA/220

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1)

Date of mailing
(day/month/year) see form PCT/ISA/210 (second sheet)

Applicant's or agent's file reference
see form PCT/ISA/220

FOR FURTHER ACTION
See paragraph 2 below

International application No.
PCT/IB2004/002141

International filing date (day/month/year)
23.06.2004

Priority date (day/month/year)
04.07.2003

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC
H04L29/06, H04L12/18

Applicant
KONINKLIJKE PHILIPS ELECTRONICS N.V.

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☒ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☒ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. FURTHER ACTION

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will usually be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA"). However, this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of three months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA:



European Patent Office
D-80298 Munich
Tel. +49 89 2399 - 0 Tx: 523656 epmu d
Fax: +49 89 2399 - 4465

Authorized Officer

Hilbig, S

Telephone No. +49 89 2399-7954



**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/IB2004/002141

Box No. I Basis of the opinion

1. With regard to the **language**, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
 - ☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rules 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any **nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence** disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material:
 - ☐ a sequence listing
 - ☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material:
 - ☐ in written format
 - ☐ in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing:
 - ☐ contained in the international application as filed.
 - ☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
 - ☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.
PCT/IB2004/002141

Box No. II Priority

1. ☒ The following document has not been furnished:

☒ copy of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43*bis*.1 and 66.7(a)).

☐ translation of the earlier application whose priority has been claimed (Rule 43*bis*.1 and 66.7(b)).

Consequently it has not been possible to consider the validity of the priority claim. This opinion has nevertheless been established on the assumption that the relevant date is the claimed priority date.

2. ☐ This opinion has been established as if no priority had been claimed due to the fact that the priority claim has been found invalid (Rules 43*bis*.1 and 64.1). Thus for the purposes of this opinion, the international filing date indicated above is considered to be the relevant date.

3. Additional observations, if necessary:

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43*bis*.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Yes: Claims	1-10
	No: Claims	
Inventive step (IS)	Yes: Claims	1-10
	No: Claims	
Industrial applicability (IA)	Yes: Claims	1-10
	No: Claims	

2. Citations and explanations

see separate sheet

Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application

The following defects in the form or contents of the international application have been noted:

see separate sheet

Re Item V.

The following documents are referred to in this communication:

- D1 : WO 02/49343 A (LEANING ANTHONY RICHARD ; WHITING RICHARD JAMES (GB); BRITISH TELECOMM) 20 June 2002 (2002-06-20)
- D2 : US 5 864 870 A (GUICK RANDAL LEE) 26 January 1999 (1999-01-26)
- D3 : US 6 397 251 B1 (GRAF MARCEL) 28 May 2002 (2002-05-28)

This invention relates to a server and a network system specifically designed for downloading a multimedia content to a client device. The problem to be solved by the present invention may be regarded as : a server doesn't have any control of which file is downloaded.

The aforesaid problem is solved by means of a server which, upon reception of an initial request directed to a multimedia content from a client device, sends a document back to the client device. This document causes the client device to repeatedly send fetching requests. Upon reception of the fetching requests, the server selects which file is to be downloaded.

Document D1, which is considered to represent the most relevant state of the art, discloses a method for delivering of recorded audio or video material over a telecommunications link from a server to a terminal. The delivery is accomplished by dividing the material into a set of sub-files, each of which is independently requested by the terminal.

Document D1 differs from the Application in that, in D1 the server doesn't have any control of which file is downloaded.

Document D2 specifies a method for **storing and retrieving files of various formats in a server**. D2 is therefore considered as defining the general state of the art and not particularly relevant.

Document D3 describes a method for distributing multimedia files from file servers over arbitrary telecommunication networks. D3 can therefore also be considered as defining

the general state of the art.

An inventive step is therefore acknowledged and claims 1 to 10 fulfill the requirements of Article 33(3) PCT.

Re Item VII.

1. To meet the requirements of Rule 6.3(b) PCT, the independent claims should be properly cast in the two-part form, with those features which in combination are part of the prior art (see document D1), being placed in the preamble.
2. Reference signs in parentheses should be inserted in the claims to increase their intelligibility, Rule 6.2(b) PCT. This applies to both the preamble and characterising portion.
3. The Applicant is requested to file amendments by way of replacement pages. He should also take into account the requirements of Rule 66.8 PCT. In particular, fair copies of the amendments should preferably be filed in triplicate.